

McCue, Kevin

From: Stockwell, Hope
Sent: Wednesday, July 18, 2012 2:17 PM
To: McCue, Kevin
Subject: FW: kw amendment info

-----Original Message-----

From: Kathleen Williams [<mailto:kathleenhd65@bresnan.net>]
Sent: Wednesday, July 18, 2012 10:41 AM
To: macwilly66@msn.com
Cc: Stockwell, Hope; stardust@usadig.com
Subject: kw amendment info

Hope - could you print out this message for Bill and Mary to have in hard copy? Thanks!

Hi Bill - I'm finally in a place where I have internet access and a few moments to summarize the amendments I proposed for LC9000, the parks bill.

I've described them by amendment number below.

1b - this is just to be consistent that we want historical skills on the board as well. It meshes well with Keane's amendment 1a.

2a - This softens the hard focus on state parks only being about tourism. It keeps the tourism component, but directs Parks to be strategic about the system's role in state tourism. We heard testimony that many Montana families use State Parks, especially in difficult economic times. We need to make sure we aren't trying to turn all our state parks into KOA campgrounds (nothing against KOA, of course).

2b - Lists get us in trouble. I recall a bill about lunches at dude ranches for people going out on horse-back, then we added hiking, then mountain biking, etc. The list isn't needed to advance the meaning, and any list will beg the question of other activities to be listed. I immediately thought of the more passive set of activities - nature appreciation, photography, etc. Best just to take the list out.

2c - This is not new language, but just moving a section that was near the end of the list up. Granted, subsections don't officially denote priorities, but they do informally. This seemed a much more important function that to appear as an afterthought at the end of all the other subsections. It was subsection g,, crossed out in the following amendment.

2d - Some new park sites may not be conducive to hunting. This gives Parks more flexibility, but also the mandate to manage hunting opportunities in Parks units.

2e - This is the idea several of us battled around - that Parks needs to be strategic about their work and role going forward.

2f - the current language seems quite loose. I'm not wedded to this one, but it seems this board will be pretty formal and should have some type of regular meeting schedule.

4 (p.5) - this I worked out with Hope, as I was concerned about the frequent reference to "board or commission" throughout the bill draft. This was one place that statutory reference really seemed to need to be clarified. Plus, "its" was grammatically incorrect when referring to multiple entities (I know, Jim, I'm SOOOO detailed!)

5a) If Golie amendments get approved, these won't be needed. I was just trying to address the concern that, when read independently, it's not clear that these statutes are only referring to recreational use. Brad raised this issue previously.

That's it for me. If you feel you need to segregate the amendments, feel free, but it would seem they could maybe all be voted on as a block. I trust your judgment, Bill. Thanks so much!!